



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Yos
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,247	01/14/2002	Adolfo Goren	P 0280702	1041
23873	7590	10/31/2005	EXAMINER	
ROBERT W STROZIER, P.L.L.C PO BOX 429 BELLAIRE, TX 77402-0429			COE, SUSAN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/076,247	GOREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan D. Coe	1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7,11,14-38,41 and 42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 8-10,12,13,39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 are currently pending. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election of Group II, claims 8-13 and 29-42, *Allium cepa* for species A and rhinovirus for species B in the reply filed on May 18, 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
3. Claims 1-7, 11, 14-38, 41, and 42 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 18, 2005.
4. Claims 8-10, 12, 13, and 39-40 are examined on the merits solely in regards to the elected species.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the

Art Unit: 1655

resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired.

See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 13 recites the broad recitation "42.9%...less than 250 microns, 56.9%...less than 355 microns, 74.7%...less than 500 microns, 21.7%...ranging between 500-850," and the claim also recites "22.1%...ranging from 106-250 microns, 6.8%...ranging from 75-106 microns, 10.8%...ranging from 36-75, and 3.2%...less than 36 microns" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 8-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derwent English abstract of Chinese Pat. Appl. No. 1089152 A (1994) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action.

All of applicant's arguments regarding this ground of rejection have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the reference does not teach that onion is the active ingredient in the method of treating the common cold taught by the reference.

Art Unit: 1655

However, applicant's claims are drawn to a composition comprising onion for treating the common cold. The reference teaches a composition comprising onion for treating the common cold. Thus, the reference teaches the claimed invention even if the reference does not specifically state that onion is the active ingredient.

In addition, applicant argues that the reference does not teach the claimed particle sizes. Claim 1 claims a large distribution of particle size, i.e. from 1 to 1400 microns. 1400 micron would be a large particle while 1 micron would be very small. It is reasonable to assume that most powdered or granulated compositions such as that taught by the reference would fall within this size limitation.

7. Claims 8, 13, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derwent English abstract of Chinese Pat. Appl. No. 1089152 A (1994) in view of US Pat. No. 4,409,237.

As discussed above, CN '152 teaches a powdered composition comprising onion for treating the common cold. The reference does not specifically teach the particle sizes claimed in claims 13, 39, or 40. However, the particle size of a pharmaceutical composition is clearly a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The optimization of particle size is taught in US '237. This reference teaches varying the particle size of an oral pharmaceutical to achieve the best drug absorption, drug distribution, and mouth-feel for the patient (see column 7). Thus, particle size of a drug is a known general condition that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 1655

art to optimize. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal particle size in order to best achieve the desired results of treating the common cold. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of particle size would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention.

8. No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Coe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0963. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:30 to 5:30.

Art Unit: 1655

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding can be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Susan D. Coe
10-19-05

Susan D. Coe
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1655